



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/721,795

11/26/2003

Yang Hwan No

K-0581

4137

34610 7590 01/02/2008
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP
P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200

EXAMINER

RIGGLEMAN, JASON PAUL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1792

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/02/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/721,795	NO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason P. Riggleman	1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5,8-13 and 15-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5,8-13 and 15-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Foreign reference</u> . |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Applicant's reply filed on 10/11/2007 is acknowledged. Current pending claims are 5, 8-13, and 15-25. Claim 5 is amended. Claims 1-4, 6-7, and 14 are cancelled.

Response to Amendment

The objection to the drawings are withdrawn.

Response to Argument

Applicant's reply filed on 10/11/2007 is acknowledged. The applicant argues that the 103 (a) rejection of claims 5, 13, and 15-16 over Czech (US Patent No. 3253874) in view of the ASA, admitted state of the art, is improper because "based on the positions of the top wall 21, end walls 22, rear panel 33, top panel 14 and various flanges 24-28, it is *clear* that the receiving space structure defined by Czech could not accommodate such a slideable coupling". This argument is not understood. It can be seen from Figs. 2-3 that the bulk of the receiving space is empty -- only the portion occupied by 17 would hinder placement of a noise filter and this corresponds only to ~ 1/3 of the front panel seen in Figs. 1-2. Also, the applicant argues that it would not be an obvious design choice to slideably couple the filter case to a top panel of a cabinet of the washing machine since this would require a "complete redesign" of the machine. Regardless, this argument is not convincing since the modification would not destroy the structure and is a **simple** modification.

The applicant has argued that the modification of Czech with Johnson, IV (US Patent No. 4019298) is improper because Johnson is "non-analogous art". Applicant

argues that Johnson only teaches a way to mount a beam to a joist and depends upon a vertical orientation of the slots, gravity and tapering of the mortise to "effectively lock" a beam to a joist. Firstly, the applicant does not claim an effective locking of the filter case to the cabinet. Obviously, the mortise and tenon would slideably couple in a horizontal or a vertical configuration. In response to applicant's argument that Johnson is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the problem is the attachment of one piece to another by a sliding coupling means. The Johnson reference serves to illustrate the common use of a sliding coupling means such as mortise-tenon joints.

The applicant has claimed the benefit of 103 (c) in regards to the 103 (a) rejections of claims 17 and 25 over Czech in view of Kwon et al. The applicant stated that supporting assignment documents were provided; however, they were not. Thus, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not understood how the filter case can be coupled to the

receiving space since a space has no physical walls. For purposes of examination this is assumed to be -- to slideably couple the filter case to the top panel of the cabinet housed within the receiving space.

Remarks

It should be noted that the term "noise filter" is not conventional to the art. The examiner does not understand what structure is supposed to equate to a "noise filter".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 13, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Czech (US Patent No. 3253874) in view of the admitted state of the art, ASA, as disclosed by the applicant.

Czech teaches a washing machine with a cabinet 11 having and tub (not shown) provided in the cabinet (Column 1, Lines 40-63). The control panel 36 forms a receiving space with a top plate (top panel 14) of the cabinet, Figs. 2-3. The control unit is installed in the receiving space and is configured to control operation of the washing machine. The control panel is coupled to a rear portion of an upper surface of the top plate.

Czech does not teach a drum rotatably installed in the tub; however, the ASA teaches a general washing machine with a cabinet 2 having a tub 4 and drum 6

provided within; a drum 6 rotatably provided in the tub 4. It would have been obvious to modify Czech with the ASA to create a washing machine with a rotatable drum to achieve the desired result for washing and dehydration.

Czech as modified by the ASA, above, does not teach a filter case "*configured to*" have a noise filter inside to be installed in the receiving space; however, the ASA teaches the use of a filter case 22 containing a noise filter 20 which filters electrical noise on the wiring leading from the control panel, installed at one side of the cabinet body, Fig. 2. The noise filter is configured to prevent interference of signals carried on wires leading to and from the control unit. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Czech as modified by the ASA to create a washing machine equipped with a noise filter (to reduce electrical interference in the wiring) which is in close proximity to control panel wiring and is protected by being housed inside the control panel housing space (coupled to the top panel of the cabinet within the receiving space).

Czech as modified by the ASA, above, does not teach a top panel coupled filter case; however, a slidably mountable (see guide protrusion 22a of ASA sliding on installation panel 2a) filter case is mounted to the cabinet body 2. It has been held that an obvious choice in design is not patentable (*In re Kuhle* 188 USPQ 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Czech as modified by the ASA, above, to create a means to slidably guide the filter case into position to be mounted with screws/bolts within the control panel housing (onto the top panel) to achieve the expected result.

Claims 8-12 and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Czech (US Patent No. 3253874) and the ASA, as disclosed by the applicant, as applied to claim 5, above, and further in view of Johnson, IV (US Patent No. 4019298).

Czech as modified by the ASA does not teach the protrusion-guide rail coupling; however, Johnson teaches a coupling assembly comprising at least one guide rail (mortise 10) provided on a surface of a beam and configured to slidably receive the at least one coupling protrusion (tenon 2) to thereby mount to a beam perpendicular and slidably to a surface (the top plate of the washing machine in receiving space). A forward end of the at least one guide rail is blocked (tenon width widens) so as to restrict forward movement of the at least one coupling protrusion inserted therein. The at least one coupling protrusion extends outward from body protrusion (neck of tenon) and laterally along a bottom surface, opposite bottom side edges (see shape of tenon in relation to beam in Fig. 1) from a central portion of the beam. It would have been obvious to modify Czech as modified by the ASA with Johnson, IV, to create a means to couple the noise filter in a tighten-sliding way (side-sliding or center-type are obvious variants) which quickly and securely fastens the noise filter to prevent detachment during vibration.

Claims 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Czech (US Patent No. 3253874) and the ASA, as disclosed by the applicant, as applied to claims 5 and 19, above, in view of Kwon et al. (Korean Applicant Publication No. KR2003-0071985).

Czech as modified by the ASA does not teach a coupling boss extending rearwards from an upper surface of the filter case and a coupling hole in the back panel. Kwon et al. teaches a back panel which has a coupling boss (B) extending forwards from an upper surface of the filter case 62 and a coupling hole configured to receive the screw S to connect to the coupling boss (coupling boss is received by hole) when the filter case 62 is coupled to the panel of the housing, see English machine translation of Korean specification. It would have been obvious to modify Czech as modified by the ASA with Kwon et al. to provide further means to secure the noise filter in place – during vibration or otherwise.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kim (KR1019990024584) teaches a filter with attachment grooves/protrusions. JP11-9889 and Wada (JP11285594) teach a noise filter mounted in a washing machine.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason P. Riggleman whose telephone number is 571-272-5935. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

Application/Control Number:
10/721,795
Art Unit: 1792

Page 8

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jason P Riggleman
Examiner
Art Unit 1792

JPR

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Markoff', with a stylized flourish at the end.

ALEXANDER MARKOFF
PRIMARY EXAMINER